

REMARKS

This Amendment addresses the issues outstanding from the final Office Action dated March 8, 2007. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this Application, as amended.

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the indication of allowable subject matter of Claims 105-118 pending Applicants overcoming the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101; 112, first paragraph; and 112, second paragraph.

Claims 105-118 and 130-143 are pending, with Claims 105 and 130 being independent. By this Amendment, and without acceding to the rejections, Claims 83-104 and 119-129 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and independent Claim 105 has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicants have also editorially revised Claims 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 118 for consistency and added new Claims 130-143 to provide protection for a method consistent with system claims 105-118. Claims 1-82 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Independent Claim 105 has been amended to recite a computer system for automatically generating a simulation model of a configuration of software simulation elements comprises, *inter alia*, storage means for storing a plurality of software simulation elements and a data processing system comprising execution means provided with configuration means. Support for the amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0177]-[0192]. In view of these amendments the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is believed to be overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, Applicants have amended independent Claim 15 by replacing “Configurator” with “configuration means”; deleted “global” from the

terms model and global simulation, respectively; removed “type” after both HDL and HLL; and deleted the term “mutually connected.” Support for these changes can be found at least in the specification from paragraphs [0045]-[0063]. Further, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner’s attention to at least the following portions of the specification that satisfy the enablement and written description requirements addressed by the Examiner on the outstanding Office Action:

Connection coherency rule table – the connection coherency rule table describes allowed connections between the various components, and, thus is used to detect the incompatibilities between the ends of the connections of different components by comparison with the configuration definition file. The source file formatting table presents the generation rules of the HLL type objects. *See* Specification, [0062], [0074], [0084], and [0185].

Global Blocks – Instantiation of the specified components is performed in the configuration definition file (FCONF), and storage of the corresponding information is in an instance connection table. Other types of components which are not in the configuration definition file, i.e., the global blocks type, intermediate blocks, and system blocks, are automatically instantiated. *See* Specification, [0050]-[0055], [0061].

Instance connection table – The instance connection table allows the addition of an adapter component (intermediate block) between components when incompatibilities between the component connectors are detected. *See* Specification, [0084]. The instance connection table also represents the instances of the components and their mutual interconnections required by the Configuration defined in the configuration file and conforming to the rules contained in the connection coherency rule table and the connection rule table. *See* Specification, [0181].

Regarding high level languages, Applicants assert that the specification provides guidance for satisfying the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In


particular, the specification describes the high level languages as languages such as C or C++, and differentiates these languages from hardware description language (“HDL”). *See* Specification, [0006], [0007], [0051], [0063], [0092]. Therefore, the term “high level language” is not indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the indefinite rejection.

Applicants amendments and arguments presented above establish that both the written description and enablement requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph are satisfied because the specification describes the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor of the instant application had possession of the claimed invention and because the information contained in the disclosure of an application is sufficient to inform those skilled in the relevant art how to both make and use the claimed invention. Moreover, the claim amendments and arguments presented above obviate the alleged indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. However, should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-908626) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Edward J. Kondracki
Reg. No. 20,604

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 610-8651
4838-1608-8065

David R. Schaffer
Reg. No. 43,089

Patrick L. Miller
Reg. No. 57,502